UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* *

BARRY JAMES CHRISTENSEN, II,

Case No. 3:24-CV-00371-ART-CLB

٧.

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO COMPEL AND MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

-

FINDLAY ARN, LLC, et al.,

[ECF Nos. 31, 32, 33]

Defendants.

Before the Court are several filings made by Plaintiff Barry James Christensen; (1) a motion to compel disclosure of ownership and organizational structure; (2) a motion to compel rule 26(f) conference and for sanctions; and (3) a motion for expedited consideration of motion to compel. (ECF Nos. 31, 32, 33, respectively.)

While Plaintiff's motions are titled as motions to compel, they appear to be discovery requests with no evidence of a meet and confer with Defendants prior to their filing. (See ECF Nos. 31, 32.)

"Discovery is supposed to proceed with minimal involvement of the Court." *V5 Tech. v. Switch, Ltd.*, 334 F.R.D. 297, 301 (D. Nev. 2019) (quotation omitted). "Counsel should strive to be cooperative, practical, and sensible, and should seek judicial intervention only in extraordinary situations that implicate truly significant interests." *Id.* Here, Plaintiff's motions present no basis for judicial intervention. Plaintiff should meet and confer with the Defendant to discuss discovery issues. Discovery requests should not be filed with the Court unless the Court orders otherwise. LR 26-7.

Plaintiff is advised that the filing of frivolous and legally unsupported motions is forbidden by the Local Rules of Practice and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court has a heavy docket. Plaintiff's case is just one of hundreds before the Court, and his frivolous filings slow the pace of her litigation. They also place him at risk of sanctions. At this early juncture, the Court will be lenient because Plaintiff is a *pro se*

9

10

11

12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

131415

1718

16

19 20

2122

2324

25

26

27

28

party. However, Plaintiff is advised that his status as pro se litigant does not give him a blank check to clutter the docket. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions, (ECF No. 31, 32, 33), are **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. **DATE:** June 12, 2025 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Filed 06/12/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 3:24-cv-00371-ART-CLB Document 35